

REMARKS

Claims 1-4 and 6-20 were examined by the Office, and all claims are rejected. With this response claims 1, 4, 7, 11, 13, 14 and 16-20 are amended, claims 12 and 15 are cancelled without prejudice, and no claims are added. Support for the amendments to the claims can be found at least at page 19, line 4—page 20, line 5 and Figure 5. This response is submitted along with a Request for Continued Examination.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections in light of the following remarks.

Claim Rejections Under § 112

At section 3, on page 2 of the Office Action claims 7-10 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as indefinite. Claim 7 is amended to remove the term “MultiMediaCard,” and to describe components of the system in which the method of claim 1 may be implemented. Therefore, applicant respectfully submits that claims 7-10 are definite.

Claim 18 is amended to recite “a control module,” and claim 17 is amended to recite “a control component.” Therefore, applicant respectfully submits that it is clear that the “control module” of claim 18 is a distinct module from the “control component” of claim 17.

Claims Rejections Under § 101

At section 6, on page 3 of the Office Action claims 1-4, 6-10 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as failing the practical application test. Claims 1, 11, 13, 14, 17 and 19 are amended to recite that the combined information is used for obtaining a common initialization timeout value for the at least two peripheral devices, and therefore a tangible result is produced and claimed, namely the common initialization timeout value. Therefore, applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections to claims 1-4, 6-10 and 16, because the claims as amended are directed to statutory subject matter.

Claim Rejections Under § 103

At section 7, on page 3 of the Office Action claims 1-3, 11, 13-14 and 16-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Schreiber (U.S. Patent No. 5,424,903) in view of Vander Kamp (U.S. Patent No. 6,233,625). Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 1

is not disclosed or suggested by the cited references, alone or in combination, because the cited references fail to disclose or suggest all of the limitations recited in claim 1 as amended. Claim 1 is amended to recite electrically combining information from each of at least two peripheral devices to produce combined information, and using the combined information for obtaining a common initialization timeout value for the at least two peripheral devices. The cited references alone or in combination fail to disclose or suggest at least these limitations recited in claim 1 as amended.

Claim 1 recites that information from at least two peripheral devices is electrically combined, for example by a bus, and not logically combined. In contrast, in Schreiber the sequence in which switches are actuated and the time delay between successive actuation of the switches are at most logically combined by a microprocessor. See Schreiber column 6, line 65—column 7, line 20. The microprocessor 40 discussed in Schreiber is not capable of electrically combining the time delay between successive actuation of the switches, and therefore this limitation recited in amended claim 1 is not disclosed or suggested by the cited references.

Furthermore, claim 1 is amended to recite that the combined information is used for obtaining a common initialization timeout value for the at least two peripheral devices. In contrast, in Schreiber the power switcher system 10 is used to apply power to and remove power from components of an electronic system according to a user-programmed sequence. Therefore, the power switcher system 10 will power on a second component after a first component has powered up plus the amount of delay time indicated by the user. A third component will be powered on after the second component and first component are powered up, including the delay time between powering up each component, plus another delay time indicated by the user. Therefore, none of the components of the system have a common initialization timeout value because they are powered on in sequence based on the user defined delay. Even if the delay information is considered to be combined, the combined information is only used in activating the last system component, and not as a common value for all peripheral devices, as recited in claim 1 as amended. In addition, Vander Kamp also fails to disclose or suggest using combined information for obtaining a common initialization timeout value for said at least two peripheral devices, as recited in amended claim 1. Therefore, the cited references, alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest all of the limitations recited in amended claim 1, and applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is patentable over the cited references.

Independent claims 11, 13, 14, 17 and 19 are amended to include limitations similar to those recited in amended claim 1, and therefore are patentable over the cited references for at least the reasons discussed above in relation to claim 1.

Claims 2-3, 16, 18 and 20 ultimately depend from an independent claim, and are patentable over the cited references at least in view of their dependencies.

At section 8, on page 8 of the Office Action claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Schreiber in view of Vander Kamp, and in further view of Crittenden (U.S. Patent No. 5,566,351). Claim 4 depends from independent claim 1, and is patentable over the cited references at least in view of its dependencies.

At section 9, on page 9 of the Office Action claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Schreiber in view of Vander Kamp, and in further view of Masui (U.S. Patent No. 6,964,018). Claim 6 depends from independent claim 1, and is patentable over the cited references at least in view of its dependencies.

At section 10, on page 9 of the Office Action claims 7-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Schreiber in view of Vander Kamp, and in further view of Masui and The MultiMediaCard System Specification Version 3.31 by the MMCA Technical Committee. Claims 7-10 ultimately depend from independent claim 1, and are patentable over the cited references at least in view of their dependencies.

At section 11, on page 10 of the Office Action claims 12 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Vander Kamp in view of Masui. Claims 12 and 15 are cancelled without prejudice, and therefore the rejection of those claims is moot.

Conclusion

The objections and rejections of the Office Action having been obviated by amendment or shown to be inapplicable, applicant respectfully requests withdrawal thereof. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge deposit account 23-0442 for any fee deficiencies required to submit this response.

Respectfully submitted,



Date: 27 October 2016

Keith R. Obert
Attorney for the Applicant
Registration No. 58,051

KRO/kas
Ware, Fressola, Van Der Sluys & Adolphson LLP
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224
Monroe, CT 06468
(203) 261-1234